



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,082	07/25/2003	Kevin V. Fliess	103580.00030/2003P00134	3514
54975 7590 10/07/2008 HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP 10 ST. JAMES AVENUE 11th Floor BOSTON, MA 02116-3889				
EXAMINER				
PATS, JUSTIN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3623				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/07/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/628,082

Applicant(s)

FLIESS ET AL.

Examiner

JUSTIN M. PATS

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 20 and 23-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 20 and 23-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. The following is a non-final office action, especially in light of the new rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101. In response to Examiner's communication of 2/20/08, Applicant, on 7/18/08, amended claims 1, 2, and 20. Applicant also cancelled claims 18-19 and 21-22. Claims 1-17, 20, and 23-30 are pending in this application and have been rejected below.

Response to Amendment

2. Examiner notes the Applicant's acknowledgement of the potential claim objections of claims 11-17 and hereby removes the objection for the time being.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 1–17 are directed to non-statutory subject matter because they fail to meet the legal requirements of a 'process'. The first step in determining whether a claim recites patent eligible subject matter is to determine whether the claim falls within one of the four statutory categories of invention recited in 35 U.S.C. § 101: a process, machine, manufacture and composition of matter. The latter three categories define "things" or "products," while a "process" consists of a series of steps or acts to be performed. For the purposes of § 101, federal case precedent has given a "process" a specialized, and limited meaning. *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780,787-88 (1876). A § 101 process must either (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. If neither of these requirements is met by the claim, the method is not a patent eligible process under § 101. Here, for example, claim 1 merely extracts, compares, and generates data. These process steps are not tied to another statutory class, nor is there a transformation of the data pertinent to the claim. The remaining of the rejected claims above also fail to add any structure. Thus, the methods of claims 1–17 are not patent eligible processes under § 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1–17, 20, 23–30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett et al. (US Pub. No. 2002/0194379) [hereinafter Bennett] in view of Haq et al. (US 6,275,812) [hereinafter Haq].

7. As per claim 1, Bennett teaches a computer implemented method for defining template information, the method comprising:

Extracting one or more key words from unstructured text (§ 0070–77, discussing the extraction process, for example, § 0075, 777, keywords such as “Mr.” indicates a name thereafter, “Jan.” indicates a date, namely the month of January, “Inc.” indicates a company; likewise, an “@”, or a “.com” in the unstructured text would indicate an email address)

Comparing the one or more key words with a taxonomy (§ 0074, discussing the application of extraction pattern sets to the unstructured data wherein contact information taxonomies such as names, organizations, and phone numbers, emails, etc. are detected within the unstructured data, and are thus tagged for template generation)

Generating information that users may wish to use in connection with task managing software based on a comparison between the contact information taxonomy and key words from unstructured text (*see discussion supra; see also* paragraphs 11, teaching that documents that may contain information that users may wish to use in connection with software applications such as task managers, paragraph 12, teaching sorting and categorizing information to integrate selected information with other applications, paragraph 26, teaching utilizing processes that identify information in source documents, extract data representing the identified information, paragraph 31, teaching the text may be unstructured text, and paragraphs 73-74, teaching the extraction process where a series of extraction pattern sets recognize proper events and pre-specified events, such as events, or task information); and

Generating one or more templates based on the comparison of the at least a portion of the information that users may wish to use in connection with task managing software and one or more predefined names or events (paragraphs 74 and 76 teach after tokenization is complete a series of extraction pattern sets to recognize proper names and pre-specified events where the pattern set would tag dynamically, for example names, places, organizations, dates, time, scheduling events, tasking events, and so on and builds templates with information extracted from the document; the system stores a set of rules to fill fields of templates with corresponding information from the documents identified during the previous processes).

However, Bennett does not teach the information that users may wish to use in connection with task managing software being a *skills list*, the taxonomy being a *skills* taxonomy, comparing at least a portion of the skills list to one or more predefined roles, the template being a *role* template, the names and events being *predefined roles* wherein each role

template includes one or more skills associated with one or more of the predefined roles, or association with a project (this limitation is not necessary for the independent claim but does factor into the dependencies).

Haq teaches information that users may wish to use in connection with task managing software being a skills list (col. 1, lines 20-37 teaches a workforce possessing the exact skills required for performing specific job functions for the success of business projects; when a project is at hand, assigning personnel with the right skills to various tasks, matching up employee skill sets with job functions, col. 1, lines 61-64 teaches assessing employee suitability for a project, col. 2, lines 5-8 teaches relating skill development of employees to job functions, roles, and responsibilities and project forecasts; i.e., a skill needs, or a skills list, or a project);

taxonomy being a skills taxonomy (col. 3, line 62- col. 4, line 25 teaches skill sets that include a complete listing of all skills required for a specialty, or task management information being skill information, and further skills can be sub-classified based on application/technology, or the skill information is a skills taxonomy);

comparing at least a portion of the skills list to one or more predefined roles (col. 5, lines 25-29; 37-39; Figs. 3-10, showing the weight or importance given to a particular skill based on the particular job function (role and responsibility));

text being associated with a project (col. 11, lines 6-21 teach various forecasts including project forecasts which are a listing of projects that are expected in the future, and staffing forecasts that indicate how many employees of each specialty would be need in the future—this limitation is not necessary for the independent claim but does factor into the dependencies);

a template being a role template for the project, the names and events being predefined roles wherein each role template includes one or more skills associated with a role (col. 5, line 24-col. 6, line 4).

Bennett and Haq teach utilizing templates which are based on various information. Bennett teaches the templates being generated using data extraction techniques, which extract data concerning documents which may contain information that users may wish to use in connection with other software applications, such as task managers (paragraphs 11, 15, 26, 35). Haq teaches software for human resource skill management for resource utilization, staffing efficiency, forecast assessment, etc. (i.e., software applications, such as task managers), where templates utilized. (col. 1, line 40-col. 3, line 20; col. 3, line 50-col.6, line 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the keyword, taxonomic text extraction and resultant template generation techniques of Bennett to the skills and role based information taught by Haq to achieve a predictable result and result in an improved system that provides the user with enhanced knowledge about the job selection and assignment process, enabling them to pick and assign the best person for and to the job or task.

8. As per claim 2, Bennett teaches retrieving the unstructured text from one or more sets of unstructured data (paragraphs 26 and 35).

9. As per claim 3, Bennett does not teach the skills list including a plurality of skills, and further comprising ranking each of the plurality of skills based on a relevance of the project.

However, Haq teaches skills list including a plurality of skills, and further comprising ranking each of the plurality of skills based on a relevance of the project (col. 5, lines 27-49, col. 6, lines 26-42).

Both Bennett and Haq teach templates concerning task information (Bennett, paragraph 35; Haq, col. 5, line 24-col. 6, line 4). Further Haq teaches the template based on a listing of skills, where the template specifies the importance of each skill in performing job function (i.e. ranking each of the plurality of skills based on a relevance to the project). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the skill list including a plurality of skills and further comprising ranking each of the plurality of skills based on relevance to that project in the teachings of Bennett in order to more accurately define the task information that is being extracted to obtain an accurate template of task information that provides a user with the ability to more efficiently sort and categorize information to integrate the selected information with other applications (See Bennett, paragraph 12).

10. As per claim 4, Bennett teaches the key words include at least one noun (paragraph 35 teaches extracting event data including names, task information, or nouns).

11. As per claim 5, Bennett does not teach one or more predefined roles are accessed from an archive of project roles. However, Haq teaches one or more predefined roles are accessed from an archived of project roles (col. 5, line 63-col. 6, line 4 teaches the manager looking up available templates in the database and picking the one that closely matches the job function at hand, or rather a manager accessing predefined roles from an archive of project roles).

Both Bennett and Haq teach templates concerning task information (Bennett, paragraph 35; Haq, col. 5, line 24–col. 6, line 4). Further Haq teaches the template based on a listing of skills, template can be access from a database of available templates (i.e. archived project roles). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include predefined roles are accessed from an archived of project roles in the teachings of Bennett in order to more efficiently sort and categorize information to integrate the selected information with other applications (See Bennett, paragraph 12), as predefined templates for use in other applications is more efficient than creating a new template.

12. As per claim 6, Bennett teaching stored templates (claim 27). However, Bennett does not teach the templates being role templates and the storing being in an archive of project roles.

However, Haq teaches templates being role templates and the storing being in an archive of project roles (col. 5, line 63–col. 6, line 4 teaches the manager looking up available templates in the database and picking the one that closely matches the job function at hand, or rather the template is being user for a job function (i.e. a role template) and which are found together in a database (i.e. an archive of project roles)).

Both Bennett and Haq teach templates concerning task information (Bennett, paragraph 35; Haq, col. 5, line 24–col. 6, line 4). Further Haq teaches the template based on a listing of skills, template can be access from a database of available templates (i.e. archive of project roles). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include templates being role templates and the storing being in an archive of project roles in the teachings of Bennett in order to more accurately define the templates containing task information and more

efficiently sort and categorize information to integrate the selected information with other applications (See Bennett, paragraph 12), as predefined templates for use in other applications is more efficient than creating a new template.

13. As per claims 7–8, Bennett does not teach at least one of the one or more skills in the role template is required for the role and at least one of the one or more skills in the role template is optional for the role. Haq teaches at least one of the one or more skills in the role template is required for the role and at least one of the one or more skills in the role template is optional for the role (col. 4, lines 5-24 teach weighting skills where the weights indicate the relevant importance of each skill in performing all the job functions associated with a specialty in that technology, where any finite weight including 0 can be assigned to a skill, 0 meaning the skill is not required of a particular function which a non-zero number associates a relative importance level to the skill (i.e. a skill with a 0 is optional, any other skill with some relevant importance is required to some degree)).

Both Bennett and Haq teach templates concerning task information (Bennett, paragraph 35; Haq, col. 5, line 24–col. 6, line 4). Further Haq teaches the template based on a listing of skills where the template further defines the desired skill level, if any, required for a job (col. 5, lines 25-36). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the weighting of Haq in the template of Bennett when concerning task information in order to more accurately categorize the information extracted from the documents of Bennett for use with other applications, such as task management applications (See Bennett, paragraphs 12 and 11).

14. As per claim 9, Bennett teaches a template as recited above in claim 1. However, Bennett does not teach the template being a role template and matching a specific individual with a role template.

Haq teaches a role template and matching a specific individual with a role template (col. 5, line 24-col. 6, line 17 teaches a skill template, or a role template, where an assessment is made of all the employees in the pool or resources for their suitability in performing various roles in the project in order for the project to be staffed by the most appropriate employees. Two metrics are used to assess the suitability of an employee for a given job function, or rather each employee is assessed to determine if they match the role template. Further, col. 7, lines 24-37 teach the employee that best matches the template is deployed on a project).

Both Bennett and Haq teach templates concerning task information (Bennett, paragraph 35; Haq, col. 5, line 24-col. 6, line 4). Further Haq teaches the template based on a listing of skills where the template defines the desired skill level required for a job (col. 5, lines 25-36) and matches an employee with the job as recited above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the keyword, taxonomic text extraction and resultant template generation techniques of Bennett to the skills and role based information taught by Haq to achieve the predictable result and result in an improved system that provides the user with enhanced knowledge about the job selection and assignment process, enabling them to pick and assign the best person for and to the job or task.

15. As per claim 10, it recites limitations substantially similar to claims 7 and 8. Thus, claim 10 is rejected for the same reasons recited above in claims 7 and 8.

16. As per claims 11–17, they are substantial duplicates of claims 1-6, where claims 11–12 are substantial duplicates of claims 1-2, claims 13 and 14 are substantial duplicates of claim 3, and claims 15–17 are substantial duplicates of claims 4–6. Thus, claims 11–17 are rejected for the same reasons recited above in claims 1-6.

17. As per claim 20, Bennett teaches a system comprising: a taxonomy (*see* discussion *supra* ¶ 7); a search engine retrieving unstructured text from one or more sets of unstructured data and extracting key words from the unstructured text (paragraph 26, 31, and 74 teach a system with a series of extraction pattern sets to recognize proper names and pre-specified events, which Fig. 2 teaches being part of a server, or an engine, the text being unstructured text); and

A generator generating one or more templates based on the key words (paragraphs 35, 36 and 56 teaches the server generating a template containing data extracted from the unstructured text, where paragraph 74 teaches the extraction recognizing proper names and pre-specified events, or keywords).

However, Bennett does not teach a *skills* taxonomy; an archive of at least one predefined project role; text being text associated with a project; the generator being a role generator, the templates being role templates for a project based on project information, predefined roles, and the *skills* taxonomy, wherein each role template includes one or more skills associated with fulfilling a role.

Haq teaches a *skills* taxonomy (col. 3, line 62- col. 4, line 25 teaches skill sets that include a complete listing of all skills required for a specialty, or task management information

being skill information, and further skills can be sub-classified based on application/technology, or a skills taxonomy);

An archive of at least one predefined project role (col. 5, line 63-col. 6, line 4 teaches the manager looking up available templates in the database and picking the one that closely matches the job function at hand, or rather a manager accessing predefined roles from an archive of project roles);

Text being text associated with a project (col. 11, lines 6-21 teach various forecasts including project forecasts which are a listing of projects that are expected in the future, and staffing forecasts that indicate how many employees of each specialty would be need in the future);

a role generator (col. 12, lines 15-20 teach accessing deployment templates and developing custom templates if needed, for specified jobs, where col. 10, lines 64-67 teach the deployment templates being skills templates, or rather the developing, which takes place on the ISDRM database interface, or rather a system element that allows the generation of a skills template, or a role generator);

role templates for a project based on project information (i.e. information from the text associated with the project), predefined roles, and the skills taxonomy, wherein each role template includes one or more skills associated with fulfilling a role (col. 34-67 and Fig. 2 teaches deployment templates, or role templates based on roles and responsibilities or various job functions where each job function must belong to at least one specialty on a specialty list and each role/responsibility must link to one or more skills in the skills list for the related specialty. Col. 5, line 25-col. 6, line 4 further teaches this as well as the skills templates are templates that

indicate the skills required to perform a particular job function, where a manager needs a person to perform a particular job function and utilizes a skills template that closely matching the job function at hand or makes required changes in a template to make it suitable for his/her requirement, meaning a role template for a project is based on project information, predefined roles, and col. 3, line 62- col. 4, line 25 teaches skill sets that include a complete listing of all skills required for a specialty, or task management information being skill information, and further skills can be sub-classified based on application/technology, or a skills taxonomy.); [wherein the role generator is configured to: compare the key words to the skills taxonomy; generate a skills list for a project based on the comparison between the key words and the skills taxonomy; and compare at least a portion of the skills list to one or more predefined roles; and generate the one or more role templates based on the comparison of the at least a portion of the generated skills list and the one or more predefined roles.] (*see* discussion *supra* ¶ 7)

Bennett and Haq teach utilizing templates which are based on various information. Bennett teaches the templates being generated using data extraction techniques, which extract data concerning documents which may contain information that users may wish to use in connection with other software applications, such as task managers (paragraphs 11, 15, 26, 35). Haq teaches software for human resource skill management for resource utilization, staffing efficiency, forecast assessment, etc. (i.e., software applications, such as task managers), where templates utilized. (col. 1, line 40-col. 3, line 20; col. 3, line 50-col.6, line 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the keyword, taxonomic text extraction and resultant template generation techniques of Bennett to the skills and role based information taught by Haq to achieve a predictable result and

result in an improved system that provides the user with enhanced knowledge about the job selection and assignment process, enabling them to pick and assign the best person for and to the job or task.

18. As per claim 23, Bennett teaches a portal for accessing the one or more templates (paragraph 56). However, Bennett does not expressly teach the template being a role template.

Haq teaches a template being a role template (col. 5, line 24-col. 6, line 4).

Both Bennett and Haq teach generating templates. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include role templates in the art of Bennett in order to improve the utilization of the templates created from the data extraction of Bennett for the predictable result of enabling a task management software application using skill sets and role templates where the templates are created via data extraction techniques.

19. As per claim 24, it recites a system for performing the limitations substantially similar to claim 19. Since Bennett teaches a system (Fig. 2 and 3), claim 24 is rejected for the same reasons recited above in claim 19.

20. As per claims 25–30, Bennett teaches the system wherein the generator operates in a composite application environment (Fig. 2 and 3),

the composite application environment including a plurality of integrated applications (Fig. 2 and 3),

the generator operating in a business application, the business application is a project management application, (paragraph 11 teaches the documents containing information that users may wish to use in connection with other software applications such as organizers, calendar, task managers, etc. or business applications such as project management applications, where paragraph 26 teaches templates based on the documents which are generated by Bennett using the system of Fig. 2 and 3),

the business application is integrated within a composite application environment (Fig. 2 and 3).

However, Bennett does not teach the generator being a role generator and the business application being a human resource application.

Haq teaches a generator being a role generator (col. 12, lines 15-20 teach accessing deployment templates and developing custom templates if needed, for specified jobs, where col. 10, lines 64-67 teach the deployment templates being skills templates, or rather the developing, which takes place on the ISDRM database interface, or rather a system element that allows the generation of a skills template, or a role generator); and

A business application being a human resource application (see Abstract).

Bennett and Haq teach utilizing templates which are based on various information. Bennett teaches the templates being generated using data extraction techniques, which extract data concerning documents which may contain information that users may wish to use in connection with other software applications, such as task managers (paragraphs 11, 15, 26, 35). Haq teaches software for human resource skill management for resource utilization, staffing efficiency, forecast assessment, etc. (i.e., software applications, such as task managers), where

Art Unit: 3623

templates utilized. (col. 1, line 40-col. 3, line 20; col. 3, line 50-col.6, line 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the keyword, taxonomic text extraction and resultant template generation techniques of Bennett to the skills and role based information taught by Haq to achieve the predictable result and result in an improved system that provides the user with enhanced knowledge about the job selection and assignment process, enabling them to pick and assign the best person for and to the job or task.

Response to Arguments

21. Applicant's arguments filed 7/18/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

22. Applicant argues that Bennett's template appears to be a template based on the type or source of information rather than the content of the extracted data. Applicant's Remarks, 7/18/08, pg. 12, 14. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. While Bennett's template is based on the type or source of information, this information is extracted via a content based determination. In order to be able to recognize certain keywords as being an email, name, company, date, or time and thus taggable, a content related determination must be made, such as the presence of an @ symbol, indicating an email address, or a series of capitalized words, indicating perhaps a name or a company; or an abbreviation Jan., Mr., or Inc., indicating a date (month of January), name (a male), and a company respectively. Therefore, Bennett's template is indeed content based.

23. Applicant argues that Bennett does not generate a role template, or a skills list. Applicant's Remarks, 7/18/08, pg. 12. In response, for a prima facie case of obviousness, the primary reference need not teach the entire limitation, namely generating a role template and a skills list. Here, Bennett is being used to teach the generation of a template, and of certain information that users may wish to use in connection with task managing software based on a comparison between the contact information taxonomy and key words from unstructured text. Although the generations don't explicitly concern roles or skill lists, these types of information

are taught by Haq and are combinable with Bennett for the reasons discussed above. Thus, Applicant's argument is not persuasive.

24. Applicant argues that Haq does not *generate* roles or role templates. Applicant's Remarks, 7/18/08, pg. 13. In response, for a *prima facie* case of obviousness, one reference need not teach the entire limitation. Here, Bennett is being used to teach the generation functionality, which is then applied to Haq's skill list and role based information to render the claim obvious, Bennett and Haq being combinable with Bennett for the reasons discussed above. Thus, Applicant's argument is not persuasive.

25. Finally, Applicant argues that Bennett and Haq are not combinable but does not offer a specific reason as to why. Applicant's Remarks, 7/18/08, pg. 14. Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the references are not combinable without specifically pointing out how their deficiencies for the purpose of combination render the rejection improper.

Conclusion

26. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A. Vasconcelos et al., *A Group Memory System for Corporate Knowledge Management: An Ontological Approach*, Proceedings of the 1st European Conference on Knowledge Management (ECKM'2000) Bled School of Management, Slovenia, October 2000, pg. 1-13 (teaching the use of ontologies in competence and knowledge management within the corporation; see Fig.4, applying ontologies to skills and roles within the corporation).

B. Sure et al., *Leveraging Corporate Skill Knowledge—From ProPer to OntoProPer*, Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Practical Aspects of Knowledge Management, 2000, pg. 1-12 (teaching the application of ontologies to the corporation for use in profiling and managing employees based on skill).

C. Eisenberger et al., U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0236714 (disclosing task driven taxonomy applications, extracting keywords from unstructured data).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JUSTIN M. PATS whose telephone number is (571)270-1363. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beth Boswell can be reached on 571-272-6737. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Justin M Pats/
Examiner, Art Unit 3623

/Andre Boyce/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623